

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended the specification to add the required Abstract of the Disclosure on a separate paper attached to the end of this amendment. It is therefore most respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the allowance of claim 3 and the indication that claims 8 and 11-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have canceled all the claims in the application and added new claims 17-28 to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action and the PCT Written Opinion dated December 15, 2000, in which claims 1-11 were added with the limitations from the pending claims 3, and 6-16. These claims now appear as claims 17-28 which are believed to be in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. in view of Yamanaka has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the cancellation of the claims. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6-7, 9-10 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al. in view of Yamanaka and further in view of Lehnen et al. has been carefully considered but in view of the cancellation of the claims, it is believed that the rejection has been obviated. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 2, 5-7, 9-10 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roy et al., in view of Yamanaka, and Lehnen et al. has been carefully considered. However, in view of the cancellation of the claims, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 4-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Yamanaka has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the cancellation to the claims. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 6-7, 9-10, 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka in view of Lehnen et al. has been carefully considered but in view of the cancellation of these claims, it is believed that this rejection has been obviated. Therefore, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.


The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Beaty et al. has been carefully considered but in view of the cancellation of this claim, it is believed that this rejection has been obviated. Therefore, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The drawings have been objected to as needing the legend "Prior Art" added to Figures 1-3 and 8. The proposed drawing changes are marked in red on the attached drawing sheets. It is therefore most respectfully requested that the proposed drawings changes be accepted by the Examiner and that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the claims, specification and drawings, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Fl.  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd  
A01.wpd

May 27, 2003